

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

COURTNEY MOTLEY,

Case No. 3:20-cv-00121-MMD-WGC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

NEVADA, STATE OF, *et al.*,

Defendants.

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a former state prisoner. On June 10, 2021, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* for prisoners as moot and directing Plaintiff to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with this Court within 30 days. (ECF No. 40.) The 30-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure

1 to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)  
2 (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

3 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
4 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the Court must consider several factors:  
5 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
6 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
7 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
8 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
9 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

10 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
11 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of  
12 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
13 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
14 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*  
15 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring the  
16 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
17 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
18 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the “consideration of alternatives”  
19 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d  
20 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file a non-prisoner application to proceed  
21 *in forma pauperis* with the Court within 30 days expressly stated: “IT IS FURTHER  
22 ORDERED that, if Plaintiff fails to timely comply with this order, this case will be subject  
23 to dismissal without prejudice.” (ECF No. 40 at 2.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning  
24 that dismissal would result from noncompliance with the Court's order to file a non-  
25 prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within 30 days.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
2 Plaintiff's failure to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in  
3 compliance with this Court's June 10, 2021, order.

4 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.

5 DATED THIS 20<sup>th</sup> Day of July 2021.

6  
7  
8 

9 

---

MIRANDA M. DU  
10 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28